CTTAB Minutes (Draft)

May 14, 2013

An audio recording (podcast) of this and previous meetings are available at http://bit.ly/cttabaudio

Comments can be provided to David.Keyes@seattle.gov for distribution to the Board or posted via Twitter including a mention of @CTTAB or the #CTTAB hashtag.

Attending:

CTTAB Members: Nourisha Wells, Ben Krokower, Dana Lewis, Brian Hsi, Beryl Fernandes, Rob Dolin, Daniel Hoang, Daniel Carillo, Stacey Wedlake

Public: Baron Kofoed (G4S Technology), Fran Clifton (Seattle Schools & CTTAB TMF Committee), Phillip Duggan (Pinehurst Community Council), Dylan Brown (Nathan Hale High School student), Myranda Miller (Group Health Cooperative), Jeff Kass (King County INet), Dylan King (Evans School –UW and Get Engaged applicant), Dorene Cornwell (STAR Center), Tim Sendgikosky, Margie Nicosia, Ken Meyer

Staff: David Keyes, Derrick Hall, Sabra Schneider, John Giamberso

Introductions
April minutes and agenda approved

Presentation by Gary Smith, City of Seattle Law Department, on open meeting laws and advisory boards.

Open public meeting records act, came in 2001. City has close to 40 boards and commissions, subject to OPMA Decisions made in open, have member of public attend this is the general principle of the act

Only applies to majority of the board, prevent collective decisions not made in public meetings. Email may be a problem, can passively receive, collective discussion has to be open

Sub-committees can be subject, if they receive public comment, must be in an open settings, and if given decision making authority

Public records require compliance with request. Subject to disclosure, applies to board members, even on a personal device. Keep your board business separate. Separate folder is sufficient. Regular practice to save documents.

Minutes do not need to be verbatim. CTTAB meetings are available on podcast. A separate state law requires written minutes, but only good faith effort to make minutes accurate. These are subject to disclosure as well.

They are exceptions – deliberative process, apply narrowly and attorney-client are exempt, entitled to advice, not subject to disclosure

Questions about Google plus hand out, doing a Skype session, in a restaurant etc.

Answer: If it doesn't involve a majority, if Google plus, less than a majority. If you say implicate a sub-committee, inquiries from other boards. E meetings do comply with spirit. Comes down to a policy decision, can't make decision, can give legal opinion. Possible having sub-committee e meeting, kind of experiment we are talking about. Provide link to everyone, where they could go for free Wi-Fi

Sub-committee, if provides public comment, must meet act. Public comment – open the floor to members.

If by being part of the committee, does not meet public requirement. Just board members meeting in a restaurant, just provide special notice. 24 hours notice, wherever open to the public, no concerns.

Board meeting formal, subs are more informal. With public comment, not taking formal public comment, just advising, just a report, not required to meet the act sub committee making a recommendation, decision making authority still resides with committee.

No decision making authority, no public comment, no problem

Civil liability – decision could be nullified, only a problem with substantive decision. Legal fees. If you knowingly act in violation, 100 fine. Rely on legal advice no problem. 100 total

Recent public record cases, no personal liability

Shared docs, no problem, shared on a format, make comments outside of a pubic meeting and decide then it is a problem. No concern of full board adopts

Proxy voting – close to collective action, vote is a final decision, done out of public meeting that is a concern. Working on a policy doc, between meeting, draft, receipt of comments, staff receives comments, consolidates, presents to full board for decision OK

Proxy votes- if Brian can't make meeting, call in, email vote on something, that's OK. You can vote for me, best if rules stipulate procedure

What do you mean by majority – 6. Does that include public, no formal board only counts

Opportunity for guinea pigs, like to try challenges

Daniel – Summary of Broadband Meeting

Four key topics – slide show presentation

Key how do we maximize cable franchise, gigabit means to Seattle, what does it mean to john smith. Process of meeting with design aspect, look and feel of neighborhoods – highest value to citizens

When is the next meeting, coming Monday, how do people sign up, contact David, info on agenda. Perez staffer on committee. Contact info on website, only names

Ben – Open Data Committee

Two committees, good umbrella, name is egov. Interface with departments, how to get data from the city. Help with work in progress

Med. Priority – drones, cttab take active role

Gov't best practices, Ivan from Peru, will deliver content, beryl will bring visualization tools, Dan help with dissemination of gov't info

Ok with naming the committee, egov. Dan makes motion, Nourisha seconds, ayes win –

Dana Lewis – public engagement comm: City and government use of social media, area for partnerships startups, hack a thon.

Any questions. Motion to approve, ayes win

Any folks liason with Puget sound off? Advise as ad hoc as needed.

Stacey: Digital inclusion Committee

TMF review, for digital inclusion – access, literacy, relevant content and services. Projects annual TMF grants, get on=line campaign. Work with comm. tech centers, connect centers to resources. Materials for public

Med. Priority = promote low cost internet options. Update, and promote in community.

Tech indicators, work with public engagement, aware of final report. Derrick will work on recruiting tech volunteers, Brian get engaged, digital inclusion plan, drill down, assign next week.

Beryl – Seattle Channel

Priorities

- Revised Seattle Mandate
  - Content and Production
  - Technology
  - Partnerships
  - Finance
  - Branding and Marketing
- Marketing Strategies
- Government Channel Survey

Motion by Brian to approve Work plans. Second by Nourisha. Committee work plans approved.

Initial Results of the Tech Indicators Study Presented by Elizabeth Moore and Andy Gordon, Applied Inference

- RDD is complete (random digit dialing)
- 90% of people have cable
- Things get more challenging for the non tech savvy
- Some weighting is occurring with RDD survey and online survey
- Cell and cable trends interesting to watch, including who has a land line
- More than 90% get access at home
- Suggestion that online results may help predict the future
- Digital divide is still very present
- 24% overall use a library
- 20% know about the cable office
- Speed and price top items that would most improve internet
- This is only preliminary information
- We aren't ready to release data, this is draft

Technology Matching Fund Grant Program

- Way more applications than we can fund, tough decisions for all of the committee.
- Great applicants this year
- Motion to forward recommendations from Dana, Bryan seconds. Vote to approve the recommendations for 320,000 to 24 groups.